REMARKS

The withdrawal of the previous grounds of rejection is respectfully acknowledged.

The Amendments

Claims 9 and 32 are amended to clarify a point about the tiotropium salt activity which was believed to be clear from the disclosure and previous claims but is now more clearly set forth. The specification sets forth that the invention is based in part on the discovery that the tiotropium salts provide an anti-inflammatory effect when administered by inhalation in addition to their known bronchodilatory effect; see, e.g., page 2, lines 13-30, of the specification. Thus, the tiotropium salts find use for treating the inflammatory component of a disease selected from cystic fibrosis, idiopathic lung fibrosis and fibrosing alveolitis; as was previously recited in the claims. The amendments are not believed to narrow the scope of the claims and/or were not made for reasons related to patentability because the new recitations are believed to have been inherent in the previous recitation and the change is made only for clarification. The amendments should not be interpreted as acquiescence to any objection or rejection made in this application.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuing and/or divisional applications directed to any subject matter disclosed in the application which may have been canceled by any of the above amendments.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejections for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 of: claims 9, 11-15 and 31-32 over Gerd Cropp et al. ("Gerd" Am.J.Med. 1996) in view of Barnes (Chest 2000) and Boucher (US Pub. No. 2002/0099023); claims 9, 11-14, 21-23 and 25-32 over Gerd in view of Barnes and Freund (WO98/27959, with US 2001/0008632 used as translation); and, claims 9, 11-20 and 31-32 over Gerd in view of Barnes and Akehurst (U.S. Patent No. 6,919,069); are respectfully traversed.

Gerd is a review article regarding the previous attempts of using bronchodilators "in the

treatment of airway obstruction associated with cystic fibrosis;" see the introductory summary. Gerd makes clear to point out that the major cause of death from cystic fibrosis is respiratory failure which is secondary to airway obstruction. Thus, Gerd distinguishes "infected and abnormally tenacious secretions, airway **inflammation** and associated tissue edema, bronchospasm and secondary fibrosis" (emphasis added) from airway obstruction. Gerd discusses the use of a variety of types of bronchodilators by several means of administration, i.e., orally, intravenously and by inhalation of aerosolized forms. Gerd's review is that bronchodilators provide variable results for improved pulmonary function; see the Discussion and Summary. The only convincing results were for intravenous aminophylline and terbutaline. The results with aerosolized forms by inhalation was variable and relate specifically to treating airway obstruction.

As stated in the Office action, Gerd fails to provide any teachings regarding tiotropium salts. However, Gerd is further distinguished in that it also fails to teach a method for "treating an **inflammatory component** of a disease selected from cystic fibrosis, idiopathic lung fibrosis and fibrosing alveolitis" or a method "wherein the salt of tiotropium provides an **anti-inflammatory** activity," (emphases added). Gerd makes clear that the methods it reviews relate to treating airway obstruction in cystic fibrosis which Gerd itself specifically distinguishes from the inflammatory component of cystic fibrosis. Gerd ascribes no anti-inflammatory activity to the bronchodilation methods it reviews.

Further, Gerd provides a less than strong teaching regarding the use of inhaled bronchodilators for treating airway obstruction in cystic fibrosis. Contrary to its teachings regarding certain intravenously administered bronchodilators, Gerd makes clear that the intravenously administered compounds gave variable results. Thus, applicants dispute that Gerd leaves one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation that the bronchodilators it discusses – let alone other ones – would be effective to treat airway obstruction in cystic fibrosis patients.

Barnes teaches that tiotropium bromide is a muscarinic antagonist used for the treatment of COPD. It is taught to provide a bronchodilating effect and thus is effective in opening airways to counter airway obstruction.

Boucher teaches a method for treating chronic obstructive airways diseases; see Abstract. Boucher includes cystic fibrosis, chronic bronchitis and ciliary dyskinesia among such diseases; see, e.g., page 1, para. 0004. Boucher's method involves administering a non-absorbable osmotically active compound to the patient, i.e., the "active compound;" see, e.g., page 1, para. 0007. Boucher also teaches that a bronchodilator can be administered together with this "active compound;" see, e.g., page 1, para. 0008.

Freund is directed to providing medicaments in the form of aqueous solutions to produce propellant-free aerosols.

Akehurst is directed to providing aerosol medicaments with a particular type of propellant and solvents.

Boucher, Freund and Akehurst were cited for their teachings regarding certain excipients in the compositions. Like the primary references, there is no allegation that these references teach that the bronchodilating compounds provide any other effect than a bronchodilating effect – i.e., treat airway dilation and obstruction.

None of the cited references provide any suggestion that a tiotropium salt would be useful for "treating an **inflammatory component** of a disease selected from cystic fibrosis, idiopathic lung fibrosis and fibrosing alveolitis" or a method "wherein the salt of tiotropium provides an **anti-inflammatory** activity," (emphases added). At most, the cited references suggest that tiotropium bromide would be useful as a bronchodilator for treating airway obstruction. Barnes provides such a teaching. However, Gerd itself makes clear that treating airway obstruction and treating inflammation are distinct effects. This is also made clear from the discussion in the specification at page 2, lines 13-30, of the instant specification. The teachings in the cited references that tiotropium salts are useful as bronchodilators for treating asthma or COPD are already stated as known in applicants' specification; see, e.g., pages 1 and 2. The discovery that the tiotropium salts provide an anti-inflammatory effect when administered by inhalation in addition to their known bronchodilatory effect (see, e.g., page 2, lines 13-30, of the specification) is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Thus, the references fail to provide a reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a tiotropium salt for "treating an **inflammatory component** of a disease selected from cystic fibrosis, idiopathic lung fibrosis and fibrosing

alveolitis" or a method "wherein the salt of tiotropium provides an **anti-inflammatory** activity."

For all of the above reasons, it is urged that the combined teachings of any of the cited references fail to render the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, each of the three rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Sopp/

John A. Sopp, Reg. No. 33,103
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: 01-1196-1-C1

Date: July 8, 2010

JAS:dap